

in Indiana for Birch Bayh, a former Senator. Then we got to the heavy stuff. The heavy stuff. That is when we went after the first amendment again for the tenth time in the last 6 years. We voted on flag burning. Oh, but we have to do that again. We have done it every year since 1994, but we had to do it again because we did not have any time.

Actually, what we had to do was fill up the time so we would not have any time to deal with a tax credit for the working class in this country, the people who work and do not have any of the perks. They do not have anything. They have to get up every morning and go to these jobs where they make \$7, \$8, \$9, or \$10 an hour.

Oh, the other thing we did today. We did not have any time today because we had to spend, after we got back from the golf course, we had to have a big debate on partial-birth abortion. We have done that I do not know how many times, and it probably is going to get through and get to the Supreme Court and be declared unconstitutional, but we had to do that today.

We could not give \$400 to a working class family. We are giving \$350 billion but we could not find \$3.5 billion to give that \$400. Yes, we are very busy, Mr. Majority Leader. I hope you shot a good game today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TAX RELIEF BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for half the time remaining before midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have to say the Democrats evidently are fired up tonight. They are feeling good. They think they have some rhetorical traction here. And it is all rhetoric when you listen to the Democrats, including the last Member, who said our majority leader was playing golf today, which was absolutely not the case. And I resent the fact that somebody would be saying a Member of Congress was out goofing off today, particularly when it is a member who works about an 80 or 90 hour workweek on average.

It is just silly, though, Mr. Speaker. The Democrat party had an opportunity to take three million low-income workers off the tax rolls 2 weeks ago, and nearly every one of them voted against that. I want to repeat that. The Democrats had an opportunity to take three million low-income workers off the tax rolls and they voted against doing it. Now, in typical fashion, the battle has been fought, the soldiers have kind of gone home, and they are wishing to reinvent the history and say, well, you all should have done this, you should have done that. But where were they at the time? This proposal was out there and they did not do it.

But just keep in mind, only in Washington do you give a rebate to somebody who has not paid into a system. The reality is, in the real world, you get a rebate when you have paid something in. The Democrats are simply back on their mantra of the Democrat party: Expanding welfare. They should not be talking about tax refunds, they should be talking about welfare expansion.

And maybe the welfare bill needs to be looked at again. It has been reauthorized. We know that under the Democrat leadership there were 14 million people on welfare. Today there are five million. That is a drop of nine million people off welfare under Republican leadership. Welfare reform, which all the Democrats voted against, has been a great success, but we do not get that kind of real discussion with them. Now they want to expand welfare. Maybe if their idea is a good one they should come out with a new welfare expansion bill so we can talk about it.

Here we have under our bill a family of four making \$11,000, pays no income taxes, about \$842 in payroll taxes, and receives about \$4,140 under the earned income tax credit. We are trying to do everything we can to reach out and help the working poor. We would like to have the Democrats help with this. Unfortunately, they do not seem to be there. As a matter of fact, this so-called tax refundability was part of the Bush 2001 tax bill, which they all voted against. So they are now mad because they voted no 2 weeks ago and they voted no 2 years ago, and they are blaming it on us.

Come on, guys, give us a helping hand. We want your ideas, but do not vote no, then pout and go home, which seems to be kind of the trend these

days. They did not like the war, they do not like Bush, and so any success Bush seems to have in terms of legislative battles in Washington they will vote no on.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit this for the RECORD, but I am going to read a part of it. It is an editorial from the Wall Street Journal today. Unfortunately, I do not have the specific author of it. It says, "The new tax bill exempts another three million plus low-income workers from any Federal tax liability." And you would think that they would be pleased, but instead they all have outrage, saying it should go further. "The tax bill the President signed last week increases the per child Federal income tax credit to \$1,000, up from the partially refundable \$600 credit passed in the 2000 bill." Again, a bill all the Democrats enthusiastically voted against. What the Democrats are saying is they want more refundable tax credits. Again, it is just welfare.

So I am going to submit this for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

[The Wall Street Journal, June 4, 2002]

EVEN LUCKIER DUCKIES

The new tax bill exempts another three million-plus low-income workers from any federal tax liability whatsoever, so you'd think the nation's class warriors would be pleased. But instead we are all now being treated to their outrage because the law doesn't go further and "cut" incomes taxes for those who don't pay them.

This is the essence of the uproar over the shape of the child-care tax credit. The tax bill the President signed last week increases the per child federal income tax credit to \$1,000, up from the partially refundable \$600 credit passed in the 2001 tax bill. But Republican conferees decided that the increase will not be paid out to those too poor to have any tax liability to begin with.

Most Americans probably don't realize that it is possible to cut taxes beyond zero. But then they don't live in Washington, where politicians regularly demand that tax credits be made "refundable," which means that the government writes a check to people whose income after deductions is too low to owe any taxes. In more honest precincts, this might even be called "welfare."

But among tax cut opponents it is a political spinning opportunity. "Simply unconscionable," says Presidential hopeful John Kerry. The Democratic National Committee declares that the "Bush tax scheme leaves millions of children out in the cold . . . one out every six children under the age of 17, families and children pushed aside to make room for the massive tax cuts to the wealthy."

Senator Olympia Snowe, the media's favorite Republican now that John McCain isn't actively running for President, says she is dismayed. "I don't know why they would cut that out of the bill," adds Senator Blanche Lincoln (D., Ark.). Those last two remarks take chutzpah, because if either woman had been willing to vote for the tax bill, a refundability provision would have been in it.

Senator Lincoln introduced the idea in the Senate Finance Committee, but then announced she wasn't going to vote for the bill anyway. Ms. Snowe was also one of those, along with Senator George Voinovich (R., Ohio), who insisted that the bill's total "cost"—in tax cuts and new spending—not exceed \$350 billion. Something had to give in House-Senate conference to meet that dollar

limit, and out went refundability. The bill passed by a single Senate vote, with Vice President Dick Cheney breaking the tie.

As it happens, the tax bill does a great deal for low-income families even without the refundable child credit addition. It expands the 10 percent income tax bracket, meaning that workers can earn more before leaping into the 15% and 25% brackets. This is a far better way to provide a tax cut than is a refundable credit, because it lowers the high marginal-tax rate wall that these workers face as their credits phase out at higher income levels.

There's also \$10 billion in the bill earmarked for Medicaid, the state-federal health insurance program for the poor. And any family that actually has any remaining tax liability benefits from the extra \$400 in child tax credit.

More broadly, the critics want everyone to forget how steeply progressive the tax code already is. IRS data released late last year show that the top 1% of earners paid 37.4% of all federal income taxes in 2000. The top 5% paid 56.5% of federal taxes, and the top half of all earners paid 96.1%. In other words, even before President Bush started slashing taxes on the poor by increasing the child tax credit in 2001, the bottom 50 percent of filers had next to no federal income tax liability.

But don't low-income workers have to cough up the payroll tax? They certainly do, but don't forget that the federal Earned Income Tax Credit was designed to offset payroll taxes and is also "refundable." In 2000, the EITC totaled \$31.8 billion for 19.2 million Americans, for an average credit of \$1,658. Some 86% of that went to workers who had little or no income tax liability.

Republicans who just voted for the tax cut could be less defensive and try to explain all of this. But instead too many of them are heading for the tall grass, with Senate Finance Chairman Chuck Grassley already promising to cave as early as this week on the child tax credit. This is the kind of political box Republicans walk into when they endorse tax credits that favor one group over another. Democrats are better at playing favorites.

We raised some hackles last year when we noted this growing trend that more and more Americans paid little or no tax. "Lucky duckies," we called this non-taxpaying class at the time. Notwithstanding liberal spinners, after this tax bill they're even luckier.

Let me just speak again for the House, Mr. Speaker. We want the Democrats' ideas. We want the Democrats at the table. We do not like this pouting: I did not get it my way, therefore, I am going to vote no. Offer an amendment, and if your amendment passes, vote for the bill. If they just want to spout the rhetoric and not the policy, that is one thing, and of course it is mighty suspicious that that might be what they are doing, but there are a lot of things we would like the Democrats' help on. We in the Republican Party would like to make the child tax credit permanent. Right now, the thousand dollar child tax credit expires in 2 years. We would like to have the Democrats help us out on that. Do you think they will?

If the Democrats want to help families with children, they should join us in eliminating the marriage tax penalty because that is phasing out. Will they help us? Will they help make the marriage tax penalty relief permanent? If they really want to help us, they

could make the 10 percent tax bracket permanent. Will they do that, Mr. Speaker? Probably not. These are things that will help the American working poor and they will help American families.

Another thing they could help us with, Mr. Speaker, not that they go out of their way to ask me for my opinions, but they could help us with tax simplification. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), a Democrat, has offered a tax simplification bill which I think would be extremely helpful. But we cannot get much support from most of the Democrats, and certainly none of the Democrat leadership.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I am going to help the Democrats refresh their memory. I am pulling up the voting record. And if I get that from the cloak room before I finish tonight, I will submit it for the RECORD. For those Democrats who are demanding that this tax credit be changed, I want to make sure they realize they voted against the original bill. This is just for those people who may be tuning in and listening, at the risk of missing a Seinfeld rerun tonight.

□ 2230

Well, here we go. These are the folks who voted against H.R. 1836 on May 16, 2001. This was the refundable tax credit, as the Democrats call it. I cannot ask the Speaker which Democrats were speaking tonight. I do not know if that is allowed under the parliamentary rules, so I am going to go from memory. I believe the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) was raising Cain, and she voted no in the first place. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), I cannot see offhand how he voted. Oh, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) voted no for the original bill.

Let us check the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). She is one of their leaders, as I recall. I cannot quite see her name. She voted no, Mr. Speaker. In fact, 197 Democrats voted no to begin with. All this righteous indignation we are hearing about they do not like our refundable tax credit, they all voted against in 2001. I will submit this so my dear friends on the other side of the aisle can check and see how they voted. Maybe that will soften their rhetoric. Maybe they can start their speeches saying I voted against this, but you all should have done a better job even though I was against you the whole way.

FINAL VOTE RESULTS FOR ROLL CALL 118

H.R. 1836: Yea-and-Nay, 16-May-2001, 4:10 p.m.

Question: On Passage.

Bill Title: Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act.

	Yeas	Nays	Pres	NV
Republican	216			4
Democratic	13	196		1
Independent	1	1		

	Yeas	Nays	Pres	NV
Totals	230	197		5

YEAS		
Abercrombie	Graham	Pence
Aderholt	Granger	Peterson (PA)
Akin	Graves	Petri
Armey	Green (WI)	Pickering
Bachus	Greenwood	Pitts
Baker	Grucci	Platts
Ballenger	Gutknecht	Pombo
Barr	Hall (TX)	Portman
Bartlett	Hansen	Pryce (OH)
Barton	Hart	Putnam
Bass	Hastert	Quinn
Bereuter	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Biggert	Hayes	Ramstad
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Regula
Bishop	Hefley	Rehberg
Blunt	Heger	Reynolds
Boehlert	Hilleary	Riley
Boehner	Hobson	Rogers (KY)
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Rogers (MI)
Bono	Hostettler	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Houghton	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (SC)	Hulshof	Roukema
Bryant	Hunter	Royce
Burr	Hutchinson	Ryan (WI)
Burton	Hyde	Ryun (KS)
Buyer	Isakson	Saxton
Callahan	Issa	Scarborough
Calvert	Istook	Schaffer
Camp	Jenkins	Schrock
Cantor	John	Sensenbrenner
Capito	Johnson (CT)	Sessions
Castle	Johnson (IL)	Shadeegg
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Chambliss	Jones (NC)	Shays
Clement	Keller	Sherwood
Coble	Kelly	Shimkus
Collins	Kennedy (MN)	Shows
Combest	Kerns	Simmons
Condit	King (NY)	Simpson
Cox	Kingston	Skeen
Cramer	Kirk	Smith (MI)
Crane	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Culberson	LaHood	Souder
Cunningham	Largent	Spence
Davis, Jo Ann	Latham	Stearns
Davis, Tom	LaTourette	Stump
Deal	Leach	Sununu
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Sweeney
DeMint	Lewis (KY)	Tancredo
Diaz-Balart	Linder	Tauzin
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Taylor (NC)
Dreier	Lucas (KY)	Terry
Duncan	Lucas (OK)	Thomas
Dunn	Maloney (CT)	Thornberry
Ehlers	Manzullo	Thune
Ehrlich	McCrery	Tiahrt
Emerson	McHugh	Tiberi
English	McInnis	Toomey
Everett	McIntyre	Trafficant
Ferguson	McKeon	Upton
Flake	Mica	Vitter
Fletcher	Miller (FL)	Walden
Foley	Miller, Gary	Walsh
Fossella	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Frelinghuysen	Morella	Watkins
Gallegly	Myrick	Watts (OK)
Ganske	Nethercutt	Weldon (FL)
Gekas	Ney	Weldon (PA)
Gibbons	Northup	Weller
Gilchrest	Norwood	Whitfield
Gillmor	Nussle	Wicker
Gilman	Osborne	Wilson
Goode	Ose	Wolf
Goodlate	Otter	Young (AK)
Gordon	Oxley	Young (FL)
Goss	Paul	

NAYS		
Ackerman	Harman	Neal
Allen	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar
Andrews	Hill	Obey
Baca	Hilliard	Oliver
Baird	Hinchey	Ortiz
Baldacci	Hinojosa	Owens
Baldwin	Hoeffel	Pallone
Barcia	Holden	Pascrell
Barrett	Holt	Pastor
Becerra	Honda	Payne
Bentsen	Hooley	Pelosi
Berkley	Hoyer	Peterson (MN)
Berman	Inslee	Phelps

Berry	Israel	Pomeroy
Blagjevich	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Rahall
Bonior	Jefferson	Rangel
Borski	Johnson, E. B.	Reyes
Boswell	Jones (OH)	Rivers
Boucher	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Boyd	Kaptur	Roemer
Brady (PA)	Kennedy (RI)	Ross
Brown (FL)	Kildee	Rothman
Brown (OH)	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Kind (WI)	Rush
Capuano	Klecza	Sabo
Cardin	Kucinich	Sanchez
Carson (IN)	LaFalce	Sanders
Carson (OK)	Lampson	Sandlin
Clay	Langevin	Sawyer
Clayton	Lantos	Schiff
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Scott
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costello	Lee	Sherman
Coyne	Levin	Skelton
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Cummings	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Snyder
Davis (FL)	Lowey	Solis
Davis (IL)	Luther	Spratt
DeFazio	Maloney (NY)	Stark
DeGette	Markey	Stenholm
DeLahunt	Mascara	Strickland
DeLauro	Matheson	Stupak
Deutsch	Matsui	Tanner
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Tauscher
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Doggett	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Dooley	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	McGovern	Thurman
Edwards	McKinney	Tierney
Engel	McNulty	Towns
Eshoo	Meehan	Turner
Etheridge	Meek (FL)	Udall (CO)
Evans	Meeks (NY)	Udall (NM)
Farr	Menendez	Velazquez
Fattah	Millender-McDonald	Visclosky
Finer	Miller, George	Waters
Ford	Mink	Watt (NC)
Frank	Moakley	Waxman
Frost	Mollohan	Weiner
Gephardt	Moore	Wexler
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Woosley
Green (TX)	Murtha	Wu
Gutierrez	Nadler	Wynn
Hall (OH)	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING

Cannon	Cubin	Schakowsky
Cooksey	Horn	

Getting back to tax simplification and national sales tax, our current IRS code is 8 million words. It is something that requires something like \$200 billion in compliance costs. That is every time you and I fill out our taxes, pay an accountant, pay a lawyer, H.R. Block, whoever, help us figure out how much we owe to Uncle Sam, we pay about \$200 billion. We spend something like 4.5 billion man-hours to fill out our taxes. There are something like 500 different forms for the Tax Code. The problem is that it gets more and more complicated every year.

What the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) proposes is let us go to 23 percent sales tax. We will not tax anything but consumption. Savings will not be taxed. Savings on used goods will not be there. The average tax liability for the average person will fall by about 7 percent, or even more, simply because you are paying right now about 30 percent. So this will help Americans not only have a simpler tax life, but it will also only tax consumption, and it will give less of a tax liability than we have right now.

This bill is in the Committee on Ways and Means. I hope that we will start having hearings on it. It is worth

a debate. We could put a small credit in there to exempt food, medical items, so the working poor are not picking up a heavier burden here. These are some of the things that we want to move to in this House, and I am hoping we can get good bipartisan support on it.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak tonight about Iraq because a large portion of this session has been spent on Iraq. The liberation of this country has been extremely well received. In fact, I have an article written by Jonathan Foreman who is a reporter there, and he talks about some of the things that he sees that do not quite make it to the prime time left wing media.

He says that it seems like the old women and young flirt outrageously with GIs, lifting their veils to smile, waving from high windows, and shyly calling hello from half-open doors, or the way little girls seem to speak English better than the little boys who are elbowing them out of the way, or the way the troops get a sense of gender violence endemic in their culture. He writes that yesterday in a poor neighborhood, two 14-year-old sisters introduced themselves to me, and they were chased away by a rock-wielding male relative.

BAD REPORTING IN BAGHDAD
YOU HAVE NO IDEA HOW WELL THINGS ARE
GOING

(By Jonathan Foreman)

BAGHDAD.—It's endlessly fascinating to watch the interactions between U.S. patrols and the residents of Baghdad. It's not just the love bombing the troops continue to receive from all classes of Baghdad—though the intensity of the population's pro-American enthusiasm is astonishing, even to an early believer in the liberation of Iraq, and continues unabated despite delays in restoring power and water to the city. It's things like the reaction of the locals to black troops. They seem to be amazed by their presence in the American army. One group of kids in a poor neighborhood shouted "Mike Tyson, Mike Tyson" at Staff Sergeant Darren Swain; the daughter of a diplomat on the other hand informed him, "One of my maids has the same skin as you."

It's things like the way the women old and young flirt outrageously with GIs, lifting their veils to smile, waving from high windows, and shyly calling hello from half-opened doors. Or the way the little girls seem to speak much better English than the little boys who are always elbowing them out of the way. Or the way the troops get a sense of the gender violence endemic in the culture: Yesterday in the poor al Sahliya neighborhood two sweet 12 to 14-year-old sisters on a rooftop who introduced themselves to me and Staff Sergeant Gannon Edgy as Souha and Samaha were chased away by a rock-wielding male relative. His violent anger hinted at problems to come here.

But you won't see much of this on TV or read about it in the papers. To an amazing degree, the Baghdad-based press corps avoids writing about or filming the friendly dealings between U.S. forces here and the local population—most likely because to do so would require them to report the extravagant expressions of gratitude that accompany every such encounter. Instead you read story after story about the supposed fury of Baghdadis at the Americans for allowing the breakdown of law and order in their city.

Well, I've met hundreds of Iraqis as I accompanied army patrols all over the city

during the past two weeks and I've never encountered any such fury (even in areas that were formerly controlled by the Marines, who as the premier warrior force were never expected to carry out peacekeeping or policing functions). There is understandable frustration about the continuing failure of the Americans to get the water supply and the electricity turned back on, though the ubiquity of generators indicates that the latter was always a problem. And there are appeals for more protection (difficult to provide with only 12,000 troops in a city of 6 million that has not been placed under strict martial law). But there is no fury.

Given that a large proportion of the city's poorest residents have taken part in looting the Baathist elite's ministries, homes, and institutions, that should tell you something about the sources preferred by the denizens of the Palestine Hotel (the preferred home of the press corps). Indeed it's striking that while many of the troops I've accompanied find themselves feeling some sympathy for the inhabitants of "Typhoid Alley" and other destitute neighborhoods and their attempts to obtain fans, furniture, TVs, etc., the press corps often seems solidly on the side of those who grew fat under the Saddam regime. (That said, imagine the press hysteria that would have greeted a decision by U.S. troops to use deadly force against the looters and defend the property of the city's elite.) Even in the wealthiest neighborhoods—places like the Mansoor district, where you still see intact pictures of Saddam Hussein—people seem to be a lot more pro-American than you could ever imagine from reading the wires.

Perhaps this is just another case of reporters with an Anti-American or antiwar agenda. Perhaps living in Saddam's totalitarian Baghdad has left some of the press here with a case of Stockholm syndrome. It may also be a byproduct of depending on interpreters and fixers who were connected to or worked with the approval of the Saddam regime. And you cannot underestimate the herd instinct that can take over when you have a lot of media folk in a confined area for any length of time. But whatever the cause, the result has been very selective reporting.

The Associated Press's Hamza Hendawi, for instance, massively exaggerated and misrepresented the nature of the looting in Baghdad in the first days after the U.S. armored forces took key points in the city. Like so many Baghdad-based reporters, she described an "unchecked frenzy" that did not exist at that time (the looting was targeted and nonviolent, in the sense that the looters attacked neither persons nor inhabited dwellings). Read her pieces and you'll meet a veritable parade of Iraqis who are angry with the United States.

Then there were those exaggerated reports of April 8 claiming (as Reuters' Hassan Hafidh put it) that "Tens of thousands of protesters demanded on Friday that the United States get out of Iraq. . . . In the biggest protest since U.S. forces toppled Saddam Hussein's iron-fisted, 24-year-long rule nine days ago, Muslims poured out of mosques and into the streets of Baghdad, calling for an Islamic state to be established." Demonstrators did come out of one mosque, but reporters seem to have confused them with the large numbers of Shia Muslims gathering for the pilgrimage to Karbala—a pilgrimage long forbidden by the Saddam regime.

There are frequent small demonstrations in the blocks outside the Palestine an Sheraton hotels—partly because that is where the press corps is congregated, but also because it's an area that many Baath party officials fled to after the war began. Anyone who assumes that the atmosphere of that

downtown area is in any way representative of the city would be gravely mistaken. However, many reporters have chosen to do just that rather than venture further out to places where they would have seen that far more typical and frequent "demonstrations" involve hundreds or even thousands of Iraqis gathering to cheer U.S. troops. Admittedly, some of those crowds include people begging for money, desperate for aid, or just curious about these strange-looking foreigners. "Most children here have never seen a foreigner" one Iraqi civilian explained to me, "that is why they are so excited." Another told me with a smile, "Everyone here wanted to go to America; now America has come here!"

More irritating is the myth constantly repeated by antiwar columnists that the military let the city be destroyed—in particular the hospitals and the national museum—while guarding the Ministry of Oil. The museum looting is turning out to have been grossly exaggerated. And there is no evidence for the ministry of oil story. Depending on the article, the Marines had either a tank or a machine gun nest outside the ministry. Look for a photo of that tank or that machine gun nest and you'll look in vain. And even if the Marines had briefly guarded the oil ministry it would have been by accident: The Marines defended only the streets around their own headquarters and so-called Areas of Operation. Again, though, given the pro-regime sources favored by so many of the press corps huddled in the Palestine Hotel, it's not surprising that this rumor became gospel.

A typical piece of reporting on the "destruction" in Baghdad came from the Washington Post's Rajiv Chandrasekaran on April 22, which repeated all the usual gossip about the ministry of oil and then quoted Saad Jawad, a professor of political science at Baghdad University: "The Iraqis had very high hopes for the Americans," Jawad told him. "But all this euphoria about change, all this relief, went away when they saw the amount of destruction to the infrastructure of the country and the carelessness of the Americans to the Iraqis' day-to-day lives." Yes, euphoria is bound dissipate, but there's no sign it has yet. More important, what infrastructure destruction? The reporter lets the charge stand undisputed but must be aware that roads, bridges, power stations, and rails lines were all left unbombed and intact by U.S. forces. The exception was power substations that fed key government buildings and broadcasting facilities (unless you count army bases and secret police headquarters as "infrastructure").

But my favorite mad media moment was when an AP journalist turned up in a car heading to the Ministry of Information, the top floor of which was on fire. "Why aren't you putting out the fire?" she angrily demanded of Sgt. William Moore. He looked at her with astonishment and asked, "How the hell am I supposed to do that?" Turning away, he muttered, "Piss on it?"

It is true that the military has been slow in some respects to make the transition to an occupation role. And the senior brass here and at CENTCOM have a lot of explaining to do about their planning for postwar operations—the Army arrived here with virtually no Arabic speakers and even after two weeks there were only a handful. But as Gen. Buford Blount of the 3rd Infantry Division pointed out the same day as the Ministry of Information fire, "It's only a week since we were in combat here," and the media have bizarrely high expectations about how quickly a conquered city should return to normal.

Even embedded journalists (or perhaps their editors) can unconsciously misconstrue the facts on the ground. For instance, David

Zucchini of the Los Angeles Times, who like me is embedded with the 4th Battalion of the 64th Armored Regiment, 3rd Infantry Division, recently accompanied my Scout platoon on a patrol. We went to an upmarket residential area, in which houses that formerly belonged to top Baath officials had been taken over by looters—and in which a house owned by Qusay Hussein had been destroyed by a JDAM bomb. I was talking to Dr. Ali Faraj al Salih, a cardiologist trained at Edinburgh, when Zucchini, a fine, experienced foreign correspondent, walked over and began listening in. I asked Dr. Ali if he'd had any trouble with looters. "No," he replied, "I have guns, with license from the government. And I have two bodyguards." "Have you always had the bodyguards?" I asked him. "Oh yes," he said.

But Zucchini's April 22 article in the L.A. Times—headlined "In Postwar 'Dodge City,' Soldiers Now Deputies"—reports "Dr. Ali Faraj, a cardiologist, stood before his well-appointed home and mentioned that he has hired two armed guards," as if the doctor had been driven to this expense by unrest following the arrival of the Americans.

Things may yet go horribly wrong here in American-occupied Baghdad. But it is bizarre and sad that so few journalists are able or willing to recognize this honeymoon period for what it is.

A lot of these things we are not going to see on TV because the press corps avoids writing about the friendly dealings with the U.S. forces and the local population, and really focuses more on rioting and looting and kind of misrepresenting the nature of things.

One report said, for example, that looting was going on in an unchecked frenzy, and that was not the case at all, and many things were actually returned. I want to submit this also for the RECORD, but it just goes to show that even now the left cannot let it rest.

Their first reaction after 9/11 was why do they hate us, as if people in the World Trade Center were somehow to blame for a madman flying a plane into their office building.

Then we heard if we go to war, it is going to the west, America versus all of the Islamic states. We are going to have the west versus Muslims. That did not happen. Then they said we are going to have thousands and thousands of our finest young and men returning home in body bags. That did not happen. Tragically some did come home in body bags, but not the thousands and thousands.

Then when we started up the Euphrates River, they said the worst fighting is further up river. Then we go to the towns, oh, it is the plan, it is the plan. And then it seems like every retired general who is looking for a little media time who wanted to dissent could get on nightly news and say what was going wrong in Iraq.

The next thing you know, we won, and they jump on a 23-year-old marine corporal because before tearing down the Saddam Hussein statue, he puts an American flag on it. Then the statue comes down and the report is about looting, and that is the way, unfortunately, the media looks at the world and looks at America. It is the blame America first crowd.

Here are some quotes from their allies in Hollywood, I do not know David Clennon, an actor, but here is what he said. "I'm saying that the moral climate within the ruling class in America is not different from the moral climate within the ruling class of Hitler's Germany."

Here is Janeanne Garofalo, another actress, "So when I see the American flag, I go, 'Oh my God, you're insulting me.'"

Here is Whoopi Goldberg, "I don't really view communism as a bad thing." That is an interesting view, but communism was not in question in the war on Iraq, but that has never stopped Hollywood, if you do not know the facts, still jump in as long as you have the microphone.

Here is somebody named Chrissie Hynde, "Let's get rid of the economic (expletive) this country represents. Bring it on, I hope the Muslims win."

Here is Oliver Stone. "Bin Laden was completely protected by the oil companies in this country who told President Bush not to go after him or it would tick off the Saudis." I cleaned that one up a little bit.

Richard Roeper, of Ebert & Roeper, sends a strong message to the Hollywood anti-war crowd:

"Even though you are among the luckiest and best-rewarded human beings in the history of civilization, you have moaned long and loud about life in the oppressive United States of America. And you have complained that free speech is practically an endangered species—though it's not as if you've been kidnapped, bound and gagged for expressing your views . . . But I'm just wondering: If you're such a crusader for kindness and decency and the rules of fair play, when are you going to say something about the atrocities committed by Iraqis since this war broke out?"

"I'm saying that the moral climate within the ruling class in this country is not that different from the moral climate within the ruling class of Hitler's Germany."—David Clennon.

"So when I see the American flag, I go, 'Oh my God, You're insulting me.'"

"We're here, we're queer!—that's what makes my heart swell. Not the flag, but a gay naked man or woman burning the flag. I get choked up with pride."—Janeanne Garofalo.

Trendy Protesting (of Republicans): Explaining why she and other anti-war protesters didn't organize demonstrations when President Clinton launched attacks on Iraq, Bosnia, Afghanistan and the Sudan "It wasn't very hip" [to protest Clinton's Wars].

"I don't really view communism as a bad thing."—Whoopi Goldberg.

"Have we gone to war yet? We (expletive) deserve to get bombed. Bring it on."

"Let's get rid of all the economic (expletive) this country represents! Bring it on, I hope the Muslims win!"—Chrissie Hynde.

"I think America has no experience with terrorism or even with war. In Europe, we know a little bit more about these things."—Bono.

"Bin Laden was completely protected by the oil companies in this country who told [President] Bush not to go after him because it would piss off the Saudis."—Oliver Stone.

Mr. Speaker, this is the caliber of debate we hear out of Hollywood, and it seems to be echoed by so much of the

media. I was actually born in Texas, and I live in Georgia right now. I used to be a Dixie Chicks fan; I am not any more. I will say this, and I am speaking as a native-born Texan, but if the Dixie Chicks are ashamed that President Bush is from Texas, I have news for them, I am ashamed that you all are from Dixie. I will say in addition to that, if you do not like it, go sell your records in Paris, and I am sure they will really like it over there.

There is a big debate going on now about who is going to help rebuild Iraq. I think that there is a humanitarian role for the U.N., but I want to point out if the U.N. is left completely in charge, they do not have such a great track record. We have been out of Kosovo for 4 years. Kosovo is a country that used to export electricity, and now they have to have rolling blackouts. Every 4 hours in Kosovo, you have to turn off your lights.

The U.N. also requires when they have free elections, that 30 percent of the candidates need to be female. They might need to be 100 percent. Free elections are supposed to decide that, not some politically correct U.N. mandate.

They have also discouraged private investment, insurance companies and so forth, are discouraged from investing in the rebuilding of Kosovo. If you do not have insurance companies investing, you do not get bank loans. If you do not get bank loans, you do not get outside investors. So the Kosovo rebuilding under the U.N. has not gone well, and that is why it is important for America to keep its presence there.

I want to say to France and Russia and to the other countries who oppose what we are doing, we are not going to kick you out of the rebuilding process, it is just when you come, bring your own checkbook.

In terms of the Brits and the 49 other countries that were in the coalition, we want them there. It is very important.

I want to read a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. Bob Braddy. He wrote a letter to Prime Minister Tony Blair in the U.K. and he says, "Dear Mr. Prime Minister, Recognizing you are extremely busy with your country's business and world affairs, my family and I wanted to take a moment to thank you for your support of George Bush and the United States with regards to the Iraq situation.

"Your steadfastness and determination along with the coalition of nations will have historical ramifications for that country that will take generations to unfold and benefit the Middle Eastern area.

"Thank you so much and Godspeed to you in all the days to come.

"Sincerely, Mr. Robert Braddy."

And Tony Blair wrote him back. "10 Downing Street. Thank you for your kind words and good wishes. I appreciate you taking the time to write. My best wishes to you and your family." It is signed Tony Blair.

SAVANNAH, GA,
March 22, 2003.

Mr. TONY BLAIR,
United Kingdom Prime Minister,
London, England.

DEAR PRIME MINISTER TONY BLAIR: Recognizing that you are extremely busy with your country's business and world affairs, my family and I wanted to take a moment to Thank You for your support of President George Bush and the United States with regards to the Iraq situation.

Your steadfastness and determination along with the coalition of nations will have historical ramifications for that Country that will take generations to unfold and benefit the entire Middle Eastern Area.

Thank you so much and God Speed for you in all the days to come.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. BRADDY.

LONDON SW1A 2AA.

Thank you for your kind words and good wishes. I appreciate you taking the time to write. My best wishes to you and your family.

TONY BLAIR.

That is an example of the grass roots affection that goes on between Americans and the Brits. We do not feel that way about every country in the world, and that is okay, too. But we want to work together on what is best for Iraq and what is best for world affairs.

I also wanted to talk about some of the other initiatives that we have going on in the House. The House continues to be very productive. We have passed already some medical liability reform, tort reform to stop frivolous medical lawsuits. If you talk to any doctor, hospital or health care provider, they will tell you that one of their biggest expenses these days is fear of frivolous medical lawsuits.

The interesting thing is that in 70 percent of these claims, no payment ever makes it to the injured party. When it does, when money does get to them, it is an average of only 50 cents on the dollar.

□ 2245

Our bill caps some of the benefits, not the economic loss but some of the noncompensatory losses. It is modeled after a law in California which has held down frivolous medical lawsuits. I hope that the other body will take this up and do something about it, because it is very important to keep down the cost of health care.

We are also going to look at asbestos liability reform. An interesting note is that right now asbestos lawsuits, there are about 200,000 pending in Federal courts. Ninety thousand new ones are filed every year. Of those 90,000 new claims, 80 percent of them have no injury involved. Eighty percent of the claimants are not even hurt. Interestingly enough, 95 percent of them are filed in six counties in the United States of America. Yes, something is going on. We need to address it.

I want to also talk about a bill we passed out of the House that we believe will turn the economy around along with our recently passed jobs package which the Democrats opposed, and that

is the energy bill. Our energy bill has three components to it, three triangles. One is conservation, another one is research and then the other one is more exploration with less dependence on foreign sources of oil. I want to just start with that. Just keep in mind, we hear so much from the environmental extremists about Alaskan oil reserves. The Alaska wildlife reserve area is the size of South Carolina. Remember, Alaska is the largest State. Texas fits inside Alaska. South Carolina is a fairly large State on the east coast. That is the size of the wildlife reserve. And in it we are talking about exploring for oil in 2,000 acres. We heard from the left and the environmentalists before in Prudhoe Bay, if you do this, it is going to hurt the caribou tribe. The funny thing is the caribou tribe actually went up after we started exploration in Prudhoe Bay. So I think we can do these things in an environmentally sensitive way. But it also ties into national security and also personal security. If somebody wants to drive an SUV and, Mr. Speaker, I know you are a single man down there in Florida, but I am a domestic guy. I have four children. I about 2 years ago was driving up to New York. I was going up I-95 from Savannah, Georgia. I did not know that you go through Delaware to get to New York. I was just driving and all of a sudden I am in a four-car collision. I have four kids in the family and my wife. I want as much metal in between me and the other guy as possible. I am driving my Suburban, which is a politically incorrect thing to many folks on the left and, lo and behold, the car behind me has to be towed away and we do not even have a scratch on the Suburban. The Delaware police who were very nice and professional said, you can go on. And so I drove on to New York in my Suburban, politically as incorrect as possible, with every kid in my family safe and unharmed. That is why I want a big car. That is why I think the moms in America should have the option of a big car. That is why it is important to realize that we have got to keep a good fossil fuel supply in this country and not just be dependent on some of our Middle Eastern allies who are not always the best allies in the world. We need to look at Alaska reserves, we need to look at Venezuela, we need to look at Russia. We need to just keep our options open, but that is a major part of our energy package.

The other thing is research. There are so many exciting things going on in research right now, cell fuels, hydrogen fuels. I was reading the other day, there is a car now that is a hovercraft. It is made by Moeller International. I think it is called an M400 Skycar. I want one as soon as possible, because it flies off the ground. It has a vertical-horizontal uptake. In fact, the gentleman from Pennsylvania probably already knows about it because he is such a fan of the Osprey, which can do that. This car just takes off and it can

toot around, a great way to get rid of the traffic jams on 395 in Washington, D.C. There is also a contraption that has already been built that if you think about it maybe like this, a lectern, the size of a phone booth, that you step in it and it flies. It is an individual spacecraft. It will go about 40 miles an hour and has a range of about 100 miles, right out of Johnny Quest which I know, Mr. Speaker, you have no idea who Johnny Quest was but I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania is an old man like me, he remembers Johnny Quest and Hadji his faithful assistant and Bandit the dog but they would fly around in these things. I am looking forward to that. It will get the kids out of the house. It will be fun.

There are so many things that the private sector is doing in the name of research right now. We are putting a lot of money in our energy bill, into more bold inventions and ways of stretching out that energy dollar. The final component of our energy bill is conservation. My dad was raised in Brooklyn during the Depression, and one of the things he taught us in Athens, Georgia, is you do not leave the room with the light left on. You do not brush your teeth with the water flowing out of the faucet. You take care of the stuff because it is all money. My dad was an early environmentalist, and he did not know it, because he made sure that we used as little energy as possible. And we recycled all kinds of things. But as I drive down Independence Avenue or Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D.C. and I see buildings, guess whose buildings have every single light left on? The Federal Government. You can drive by the Department of Energy, and I hate to say it, it does not matter who is in charge, Democrats or Republicans, the lights are left on. We have got to turn the lights off. We in the Federal Government need to lead the way in conservation. That is part of our energy bill, is credits for smart buildings, credits for energy-wise construction and all kinds of things like that. I hope that the other body will take this important piece of legislation up.

We also have other things that we have passed, such as the healthy forests initiative, very important. We have some endangered species relief for our military in a very good defense package. We have Medicare coming up, Medicare reform which will have a prescription drug package. We are going to have some post office reform coming up. A lot of things for veterans. The left does not like it but we did increase veterans health care spending by about 12 percent. I believe they all voted against that. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says yes. We are going to continue to stand up and do everything we can for the veterans. I am a supporter of the veterans history project which the Library of Congress is initiating and was passed under Republicans in the House. The great thing

about the veterans history project is if you are a veteran of any war and you have a story to tell, not necessarily a glorious story but we want to know about your experience in the war, contact the Library of Congress, contact your local Congressman and we can archive that forever so that your great grandchildren can go back and see what you did in the war.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania on his work on the defense authorization bill. I think it is a great bill, and also for touching the sensitive area of training in the areas where there are endangered species, because I think you have got a good balance in there but many people do not understand that some of the training that our military does has greatly been hampered by the possibility that a species may be there and it is not even confirmed that they are. I represent Fort Stewart. They have a big problem with the red-cockaded woodpecker.

RESULTS OF TRIP TO NORTH KOREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced guidelines, the balance of the majority leader's hour is reallocated to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), and, without objection, his previous order for 5 minutes is vacated.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me to take the rest of this time. It is tough to follow the gentleman from Georgia. He is not only a nice human being but he is a real genuine person as you can tell by the way he handles issues, totally committed to his job and his family. I want to let the gentleman know he is someone for whom I have the highest admiration and always brings a few laughs to us while he use that kind of down-home southern humor to convey the real message of what the American people want us to be doing. I thank my friend and colleague for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise for the major purpose of outlining the results of a trip that I led to North Korea this past weekend, but I want to start out by responding to some of the concerns raised by my colleagues on the other side where they have continued to demagog and basically say that President Bush and the administration lied about the reasons for the Iraqi war. I heard one of our colleagues earlier say, show me the evidence of weapons of mass destruction. I could not help let that go by, Mr. Speaker. I am the vice chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services. I work issues involving proliferation of weapons of mass destruction technology, and for anyone to suggest that there just was not a case of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq is just plain wrong. In fact, all one has to do is go to the U.N. and look through

the records of the U.N. on abuses of human rights and look at the record of Saddam Hussein.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I will at this point in time insert in the RECORD two charts. One is the past Iraqi use of weapons of mass destruction and the second is the amount of weapons of mass destruction that Iraq admitted to having at the time of the war.

1. PAST IRAQI USE OF WMDS

Date	Area used	Agent	Casualties	Target pop.
1983	Haji Umrar ..	Mustard	<100	Iranians/ Kurds.
1983	Panjwin	Mustard	3,000	Iranians/ Kurds.
1984	Majnoon Is- land.	Mustard	2,500	Iranians.
1984	al-Basrah	Tabun	50-100	Iranians.
1985	Hawizah	Mustard/ Tabun.	3,000	Iranians.
1986	Marsh. al-Faw	Mustard/ Tabun.	8-10,000	Iranians.
1986	Umm ar Rasas.	Mustard	5,000	Iranians.
1987	al-Basrah	Mustard/ Tabun.	5,000	Iranians.
1987	Sumar/ Mehran.	Mustard/ Nerve.	3,000	Iranians.
1988	Halabaj	Mustard/ Nerve.	800	Kurds.

2. AMOUNT OF WMDS IRAQ ADMITS HAVING

Weapon	Effect	Quantity Iraq claimed
VX	Nerve Agent—Paralysis and Death	3.9 Tons.
Sarin	Nerve Agent—Paralysis and Death	812 Tons.
Mustard Gas	Blister Agent—Burns Skin, Eyes, and Lungs.	3,080 Tons.
Anthrax	Bio Agent—Lung Infection and Death.	2,200 Gallons.
Botulinum	Bio Agent—Death if inhaled or Di- gested.	5,300 Gallons.
Aflatoxin	Bio Agent—Causes Liver Cancer	520 Gallons.

Mr. Speaker, the facts cannot be refuted. Saddam Hussein was responsible for killing over 20,000 human beings by using weapons of mass destruction. What were they? Mustard gas, tabun, nerve gas. From 1983 to 1988, known facts in this chart which our colleagues can read tomorrow in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are the specific dates, the locations and who was killed. And who was killed? Iranians and Kurds. Innocent people. And what did Iraq admit when in 1991 they in fact were kicked out of Kuwait? What did they tell the U.N. they had? They told the U.N. they had VX, which is a nerve agent, causes paralysis and death. In fact, they publicly said we have 3.9 tons of VX. They said they had sarin gas, nerve agent, causes paralysis and death, 812 tons. They said they had mustard gas, a blister agent, burns the skin, eyes and lungs, 3,080 tons. They said they had anthrax, a biological agent, lung infection and death, 2,200 gallons. They said they had Botulinum, a biological agent, death if inhaled or digested, 5,300 gallons; and they said they had aflatoxin, another bioagent that causes liver cancer, 520 gallons.

Mr. Speaker, this was the leadership of Iraq publicly telling the U.N. what weapons of mass destruction they had. For my colleagues and friends to stand up here and say they do not have any weapons of mass destruction and therefore the administration lied is just wrong and it is really unfair. In fact, every major debate involving the